



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

## Are Globalist Goals Good?

Melinda Gates, co-founder of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, says life will change for the better because of COVID-19. She told the *Hindustan Times*,

Sometimes out of a crisis comes something beautiful. I look back at some of the wars and you think about what was rebuilt after the war to maintain peace and stability around the globe. Look at the World Health Organization that was formed to make sure that we have information about health and share that around the globe. I think we will have to build new institutions. We'll have to do more to protect everybody and the vulnerable.

There are signs that people want something different. They already wanted something different before the pandemic. And I think the pandemic has exposed the cracks in all of our societies, the gaps and the people we don't take care of, and now it's in our face. Women's unpaid work; no one can turn away from that. It's in our home every single day, women taking care of the children or taking care of the elderly during the pandemic. I think there are ways that we will be able to build back and build back in a better way.



AP Images

AP Images

Americans are constantly told that Big Government is for our own good. It will aid the poor, the sick, the elderly, the young, and more. It will even fix all environmental ills, including global warming. Now efforts are far under way to move the world to global socialism, with promises being made by globalists to accomplish the same humane and environmental goals at the global level. (See article on page 10.)

Let us assume that globalists are well-meaning and actually *do* follow through on some of their stated objectives, and then let's determine whether their plans would actually lead to increased well-being and wealth for the world's common man and betterment of the environment.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

## Going Green

Since one of the biggest concerns that the globalists claim to have is the environment, we'll start there.

To save the world from the supposed catastrophes that go along with increased atmospheric warming, the globalist game plan is to:

- Force Western countries to switch to electric cars and mandate green fuels for air travel (or, as Democrats' Green New Deal calls for, eliminating air travel);
- Require the West to almost exclusively use wind and solar power, both for public utilities and private entities; and
- Mandate the reduction of methane and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from agricultural and industrial processes.

Let's take these one at a time, beginning with electric cars. Electric cars are widely thought to be cleaner than gas-guzzling autos and much better for the environment, but as with all forms of energy, there are tradeoffs: There are definite benefits provided, but those benefits go hand-in-hand with negative consequences, as is always the case with energy.

A primary tradeoff in this case concerns price, relevant since we are examining whether globalists' "build back better" renewable policies will help the little guy. And it turns out that this isn't a small consideration. Writing at RealClearPolitics on December 29, 2020, auto dealer Geoffrey Pohanka drove three electric cars — by Volkswagen, Honda, and Hyundai — and not only was the cost to power these cars using publicly available fast-charge charging stations nearly twice as much as the cost of using gasoline to go the same distance (\$21.07 vs. about \$13), but charging took a lot of time. (To be plain, charging costs were less than gasoline costs when charging at home, but that took *lots* of time.)

Charging the Hyundai Kona at home took about 10 hours for an advertised 250-mile range. If Pohanka had to use a public charging station with a fast-charger, say for a long trip, charging the car would take an hour and 10 minutes, and that's assuming he could get a charger and not have to wait in a long line. If he had to rely on public charging stations daily, as most urbanites would, to drive his normal 80-mile days, he'd have to spend over 200 hours per year — "the equivalent of 25 eight-hour working days" — charging his car at public charging stations, again assuming he could get a charger without having to wait in line. And time lost often means money lost.

Then there are the other costs of electric cars. Not only is the average price of an electric car higher than a gasoline-powered car, with mid-priced electric cars in the mid-\$30,000 range, there aren't many used electric cars for poor people looking for a deal, so they'll likely either have to pay full price or, if they can't foot the bill, ride public transportation. Too, electric cars have higher repair costs, and higher insurance costs than gasoline cars. All facts the poor will undoubtedly find revolting.

To boost the acceptance of electric cars, in addition to some car manufacturers already committing to cease building gasoline-powered vehicles altogether, globalists plan to rely heavily on taxing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The Shell Oil corporation, a President's Circle-level corporate member of the globalist Council on Foreign Relations, was blunt about this in its booklet entitled "A US-Net Zero CO<sub>2</sub> Energy System by 2050":

The US currently has a patchwork of carbon pricing policies at the state, regional, and



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

sectoral levels. The carbon price trajectory ... sufficient to deliver and sustain final emissions cuts and CO<sub>2</sub> management over the next three decades, which is necessary for the US to reach net-zero emissions by 2050 ... will require combining state-level action with federal action on carbon pricing to drive the necessary scale and pace of change consistently over time and coherently across sectors. In the long term, a government-led carbon tax or emissions trading mechanism at the federal level will be necessary to provide the clear and consistent price signal required for the energy system to achieve net-zero emissions.

In other words, expect *huge* price increases on any product made of fossil fuels — hurting average Americans.

Ironically, once Americans and other Westerners incur all those costs, electric cars won't have much of an impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions anyway because most electricity is generated from burning fossil fuels, and even if a country does load up with solar panels and wind turbines, that move likely would still mean *high* CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, not low emissions.

Environmental icon and recipient of *Time* magazine's "Hero of the Environment" award Michael Shellenberger explained the deficiencies of wind and solar power in a Ted Talk entitled "Why renewables can't save the planet." First, he pointed out, wind and solar power are variable — coming and going with the vagaries of wind and clouds — and that means that they must be backed up by some other reliable power source to avoid rolling blackouts. He related his own very expensive lesson in renewable power. After a group he led convinced the Obama administration to put \$150 billion toward solar and wind, he learned that those energy sources only provide power between 10 and 30 percent of the time, on a yearly basis. Moreover, he learned, since batteries as backup would be costly (many trillions of dollars for America alone), mining the components for them is energy intensive and environmentally polluting, and the batteries would have to be replaced every three to five years (just like car batteries), they are a nonstarter. And since there aren't nearly enough hydroelectric dams sufficient to do the back-up job, *that leaves fossil fuels to provide back-up power* for solar and wind in the globalist playbook.

Shellenberger emphasized that he originally believed that green power's problems were technical and could be overcome via political investment and willpower, but he eventually learned that there aren't technological answers to the problems — something that Texans learned all about in February, with dozens of residents freezing to death owing to unreliable electricity. Texas, as a state, gets the greatest proportion of power from green energy in the nation — upwards of 20 percent — and when the storm hit, the wind turbines either froze or the turbine blades iced up, causing them to go out of balance, meaning they had to be shut down so that they wouldn't vibrate themselves apart into very big, dangerous pieces.

It's noteworthy that Texas knew the storm was coming and asked the federal Department of Energy for permission to increase its production of energy from fossil fuels to weather the storm, and the plea was initially rejected. The DOE issued Order No. 202-21-1 in which, though acknowledging the "imminent threat of widespread ... loss of life," it basically told Texans to suffer through. The DOE told Texas to keep using so-called renewable power, to ask other states to send energy (though they were hit with the



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

same storm), and to gouge ratepayers if the state did use extra fossil-fuel power (the non-green power had to “be offered at a price no lower than \$1,500/MWh,” as compared to the previous year’s cost of \$18.20 per megawatt-hour). Homeowners who during the storm still had power saw electricity bills in excess of \$17,000!

As per usual, Texas had installed the green energy in the first place in response to government incentives, *not because it was useful or cost-effective*. Green energy’s failings are apparent if one looks closely. Even Germany, the world’s green energy leader, still generates most of its electricity from coal — because it has to, *Wired* magazine notes in its 2018 article “If Germany Can’t Quit Coal, Can Anyone Else?” Germany wants to produce all its energy from green power sources, but can’t. The magazine makes the case for continuing to use coal, but to also somehow lock power-plant emissions in the ground.

Clean Energy Wire, an online journal focused on transitioning to zero CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, admits in its 2020 article “Germany’s Dependence on Imported Fossil Fuels” that not only does Germany now rely on coal, petroleum, and natural gas to function, but Germany’s aim to be CO<sub>2</sub>-neutral by 2050 is totally dependent on technologies that are in their infancy and are not proven to work at scales countries need to survive, technologies such as “green hydrogen,” also called “blue hydrogen,” which is a man-made, extremely volatile, hard-to-store gas that is planned to be used in place of petroleum products.

Importantly, the article comments in an offhand manner, while the EU is in the process of transitioning to green energy, it is becoming increasingly dependent on fossil-fuel imports from countries such as Russia — creating EU reliance on foreign countries and giving potential adversaries the power to dictate EU national policy. Can you say “economic suicide”?

Talk about a green-energy snow job!

Because green energy must essentially be paid for multiple times (in the form of money for wind turbines and solar panels, the government subsidies that must be paid so they’ll actually be used, and money toward fossil-fuel generation to back it up), its costs are very high.

Even as the price of solar panels has dropped, “green” California saw its energy prices rise five times as fast as the rest of the country. Germany, the center of renewable-energy production, saw its energy prices rise by 50 percent as it moved to renewables. Not only does this spell trouble for industries trying compete on a global scale (meaning many lost jobs for Westerners), but high energy prices take their biggest toll on the aged and the poor living on fixed incomes, when they pay for electricity — so much for caring about the common man.

And the costs associated with “going green” will hit the poor even before the Western world is fully larded up with wind turbines and solar panels, especially in the United States. As part of going green, the U.S. government is discouraging the oil-and-gas-recovery method known as fracking, as well as oil exploration and recovery on federal lands — already putting a supposedly temporary ban on new oil leases on public land as it investigates how to lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. If there’s an end to the “pause on leasing,” we can expect onerous regulations on drilling, much higher fees and taxes on energy-producing industries, and more, so Americans will see not only *much* higher prices at the pumps (which, again, mainly hurts the downtrodden — with the average American driver using 656 gallons of gas each year, and with households often having multiple drivers), but a loss of jobs.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

## Making the Sacrifice

It means the loss of *a lot* of jobs: Though the Obama administration and Vice President Biden made some efforts to impede fracking on public lands by creating costly rules and regulations, they were largely unsuccessful. In fact, studies show that “the dramatic increase in oil and gas production [from fracking] spurred the creation of 4.3 million direct, indirect, and induced jobs in the United States between 2009 and 2015,” according to a report by the Heartland Institute entitled “Fracking Boom Masks Obama’s Horrifying Economic Numbers.” That equates to nearly half the jobs produced during Obama’s time in office and, as the report says, “without the jobs created or supported by hydraulic fracturing, Obama would have the worst record on job creation of any two-term president in recent history.” So the country succeeded *despite* Obama/Biden, not because of them. Now, under Biden, who is globalist through and through, we get to see the gutting of those same jobs.

Those who really worry about supposed catastrophic effects of global warming due to CO<sub>2</sub> can pat themselves on the back; this time around the Biden administration will do its utmost to really hurt the oil industry — and all the workers tied to it. It is *extremely important* to be aware that jobs supported by the fossil-fuel industry will largely *not be replaced* by solar and wind jobs: Green industries aren’t producing enough jobs to absorb out-of-work fossil-fuel workers, the green jobs usually pay less than previous jobs, the green jobs usually require retraining, and the green jobs will largely end when the big solar and wind farms are installed.

But even that is not the end of the green-energy drama: Solar and wind power aren’t good for the natural environment either. Wind turbines are one of “the most significant threats” to eagles, condors, owls, hawks, and other big bird species, including endangered species, and solar farms mean the complete denuding of huge landscapes. (It turns out that solar panels mounted on buildings aren’t very efficient, so other lands must be used.) Shellenberger was devastated to see desert tortoises pulled from their burrows and transferred to zoos, where many of them died, to make room for a solar complex.

(To find out how to *really* generate low-cost, safe, clean electricity in abundance, and help the environment, watch Shellenberger’s video. Hint: He came to the same conclusion that The New American has been pushing since its inception.)

The globalist-approved energy situation doesn’t look a lot more friendly in the skies than on the ground. The International Air Transport Association said that, in the name of being green, the industry wants to transition to biofuels — fuels made from plants. Because the plants would take some CO<sub>2</sub> from the air before they are burned as fuel, they lower overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as compared to normal jet fuel.

However, Neste, an airline biofuel company, is selling biofuels for three to four times the cost of traditional jet fuel. Since in the past a 50-percent rise in jet fuel prices was associated with a \$10 to \$20 increase in the cost of a domestic airline fare, using biofuels exclusively looks to add substantially to the cost of a typical airline ticket (if any company can supply such biofuels in large volume, which doesn’t look promising). So the middle class can plan on a lot less vacations.

Finally, there’s the mandate that Westerners reduce methane and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from agricultural and industrial processes. As far as agriculture is concerned, reductions primarily mean cutting back on eating meats (to reduce animal farts, literally). As Douglas Broom wrote for the globalist World Economic Forum, since “farming animals for meat generates 14.5 percent of total global greenhouse





Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

emissions,” we need to learn to eat weeds, such as dandelions, and bugs (insects). *Forbes* sang the same tune in a 2019 article entitled “Is a Meat Tax a Good Idea?” which makes the case for a meat tax. The arguments for a meat tax include stopping deforestation for grazing lands, inhibiting climate change, and increasing human health (because supposedly meat is bad for you, despite studies showing the opposite). At the time the article was written, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden were already contemplating such a scheme. And the costs wouldn’t be small. The author wrote: “A 2016 analysis of meat taxes worldwide found that levies of 40 percent on beef, 20 percent on dairy products and 8.5 percent on chicken would save half a million lives a year and dramatically reduce climate warming emissions.”

According to [Statista.com](#), the average American family of four eats about 231 pounds of beef a year. With even “inexpensive” hamburger running at about \$4 a pound, to continue eating beef, that family’s new annual beef tax would be \$369. The tax would go *much higher* for choice cuts of meat, such as steak or roasts. That family’s new added yearly chicken tax would be \$25, for mass-produced meat. Organic poultry would more than double those figures. And since a four-person family would consume about 2,612 pounds of dairy products — including yogurt, cheese, butter, milk, and ice cream — that would mean a tax of hundreds more dollars each year in that area. Obviously, the poor and middle class aren’t meant to eat this up.

Such taxes being implemented is not a far-fetched scenario either: Already in 2019, 67 Democrats introduced H.R. 109, which would not only virtually eliminate air travel, but the eating of steaks, as well.

Even if we assumed that taxing meat would fix any environmental problems — a big “if” — it would mean the ruination of a large part of the agricultural industry and the blue-collar jobs it provides. The situation calls to mind a joke: “A doctor told his patient that if he wanted to live a long, healthy life he must give up sex, eating fatty foods, and drinking alcohol. To which the man replied, ‘You call that *living*?’”

Rest assured that globalists will continue living the way they wish. For instance, the first American president to place a priority on “fixing” global warming was Barack Obama, and his favorite foods were steaks and burgers. Climate crusader Leonardo DiCaprio not only owns numerous houses and gas-guzzling luxury cars, but flies private jets instead of taking commercial flights. He even chartered a 747 jet to travel halfway across the world simply to enjoy New Year’s eve celebrations twice in the same year. And attendees at a global-warming confab in Sicily in 2019 sponsored by Google arrived in 114 private jets, as well as super-yachts that burn over 500 gallons of fuel per hour. Once there they stayed at the luxurious Verduna Resort and zipped around in Maseratis.

Most of the rest of us, however, will suffer the blue-collar blues. Besides agricultural jobs, fossil-fuel employment, and all the jobs related to them (truck drivers, machine manufacturers, cheese makers, and more) being lost, other industries are set to go under the “green” gun, having jobs gutted, as well. The periodical *Chemistry & Engineering News* reported in its article “Activists Rally to Put a Lid on Plastics”:

Late last year ... more than 550 groups, including international environmental organizations like Greenpeace and regional community advocates such as the Louisiana Bucket Brigade, delivered a petition to the incoming Biden administration calling for executive action to reduce plastic waste,



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

pollution from plastics manufacturing, and plastics production itself.

The Presidential Plastics Action Plan, referred to on its website and on social media as #PlasticFreePresident, now has over 600 signatories. Its goals include curbing production of single-use plastics and halting permits for new plastics facilities.

Meanwhile, the Break Free from Plastic Pollution Act, a 2020 bill due to be reintroduced in the months ahead in the US Senate by Jeff Merkley (D-OR) and in the House of Representatives by Alan Lowenthal (D-CA), calls for similar legislative action to curtail plastics pollution.

The push would entail banning new petrochemical infrastructure (think plastic industries and jobs), banning fracking, and banning “the export of gas liquids and monomers and polymers used for plastic production.” The claimed motivation behind the action is to reduce the large amount of plastics that fail to get recycled and end up in an incinerator, the environment, or landfills, “in response to ‘the aggressive expansion’ of the petrochemical industry on the Gulf Coast and in Appalachia.”

According to Fracktracker Alliance, as of now petrochemical plants use about a third of the petroleum produced worldwide and are expanding at such a fast rate that they are set to use 50 percent of the world’s yearly pumped petroleum by 2050. But globalists and their allies want to kill these jobs here and in the EU. Notably, most petrochemical jobs in the United States are in the country’s midsection, where conservatives predominate: Texas, Louisiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

Globalists and their environmental radical allies aren’t letting the fact that petrochemicals are the basis for more than 6,000 common household items — such as vitamin capsules, antihistamines, dyes, antiseptics, fertilizers, nylon, hair coloring, lipstick, shampoos, and hundreds of other products that literally make modern life possible — deter them in any way. Or that the Environmental Protection Agency named five Asian nations — China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam — as being most responsible for plastic waste in the oceans, a finding not too shocking if one has ever viewed video of rivers in those countries clogged with plastic packaging.

Similarly, Europe is implementing a tax on plastics to discourage their production and use, and the EU has greatly deterred fracking in order to halt drilling for petroleum and natural gas, as well. And since countries such as India and China will not follow such a suicidal course, such a movement is really a huge jobs-transfer plan, from countries in the West to elsewhere.

So while globalist policies on the “green” front don’t look to put an appreciable dent in the lifestyles of globalist elites, there’s no such good news for the rest of the West.

Importantly, if you are one of those who believe that America should make any and all sacrifices necessary to lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and save the world, know that even if our country eliminated all CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tomorrow, it would have no noticeable effect on Earth’s temperatures. On January 27, John Kerry, Biden’s leading climate spokesman, acknowledged as much, admitting that “almost 90% of all of the planet’s emissions ... come from outside of U.S. borders.” Moreover, the International Energy Agency (IEA) reported that while the West, including the EU, the United States, and Japan, has lowered its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions since 1990, its reductions have been vastly outstripped by increased CO<sub>2</sub> production in the rest of the world.

Notably, the country that has been vilified the most, the United States, has seen the greatest reductions. The IEA said: “US emissions are now down almost 1 Gt [Gigaton] from their peak in the year



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

2000, the largest absolute decline by any country over that period.” In 2018-2019, during the age of Trump, CO<sub>2</sub> reductions by the United States nearly equaled the reductions of all the countries in the EU combined.

Long story short: Even if rising CO<sub>2</sub> really were damaging to the planet, the United States isn’t really an environmental villain. No matter what CO<sub>2</sub> reductions the West makes, other countries will offset the reductions, meaning that if CO<sub>2</sub> really can cause serious climate change, it’s a done deal — you’d better spend money to offset it, not trying to stop it.

Onward and downward.

## Wealth Winners and Losers

A second area where the globalists want to make radical changes is in “equity,” specifically, providing an equitable income, or at least a livable income, to all. As Pope Francis said, “Give to all access to the fruits of creation, to the basic needs of life: to land, lodging and labor.”

Let’s see how that scheme is likely to play out for the less-than-rich.

To begin with, the belief that any government can simply give unlimited amounts of wealth to the downtrodden to lift them up is faulty. It ignores the basics of both economics and human behavior.

Wealth is not created via a printing press. When countries simply print money to pay their bills, price inflation quickly skyrockets, devastating economies, and it eventually becomes apparent that the currency isn’t any more valuable than the paper it’s printed on.

Historically, such an occurrence has been commonplace. It is presently happening in Venezuela. Focus Economics estimates that country’s 2020 inflation rate at 2,685 percent — in other words, 2020 prices for goods and services were 26 times higher than 2019 prices. And it has happened in countries across the world, including the United States, wherein an early form of paper currency called the “continental” became virtually worthless over about five years’ time. This fact has always been true, and will always remain true. In America now, during an economic slump, real estate prices are spiking, with many places seeing prices go up by a third in the last year. Building materials are equally pricey. From 2011 to 2020, the price of food in this country has gone up 20.3 percent, according to [usinflationcalculator.com](#). Some financial experts expect overall inflation to be 20 percent in the year 2021 alone, thanks to the government printing money for giveaways for COVID and “infrastructure.”

The government gives funds with one hand, but takes it back from the poor with the other, plus interest of course.

Real wealth is created through the provision of goods and services, and only by encouraging wealth production worldwide can the poor be empowered and enriched worldwide. There already have been many instances where business activity has made dramatic differences in the lives of the poor. After decades of grinding poverty under strict socialism, both China and India have seen huge declines in poverty as they relaxed government controls and encouraged entrepreneurship. Between the two countries, in just over 30 years, more than a billion people were lifted from profound poverty — defined as an income of less than \$1.90 per day — via increased economic opportunity, according to the blog Our World in Data.





Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

Conversely, the act of giving away money has failed to make the lives of the poor better off, despite many decades of trying. As Development Economist George B.N. Ayittey pointed out, even the UN acknowledged in 1999 that 70 aid-receiving countries were poorer than they were in 1980. Forty-three countries were worse off than they were in 1970.

The *only country* in the world that appears to have become better off from international financial aid is Israel.

Since the new globalist poverty plan is merely a variant of the old plan, we can expect to see similar failed results. Under their present plan, instead of giving donated money to Third World governments, which were supposed to spend it in ways to help the poor but didn't, globalists now insist that Western nations take in massive migrations of poor people, people who'll then be the responsibility of the nations that took them in. As the *Epoch Times* reported in its article "UN 'Migration Networks' to Facilitate Migration Stir Concern," the UN is pushing increased immigration worldwide

with the establishment of a UN "Network for Migration" in dozens of countries to facilitate large migratory flows, sparking alarm among American border-security advocates already concerned about mass migration and the escalating crisis at the U.S.-Mexico border.

The UN networks, which are led by a coalition of UN agencies, exist to support the implementation of the controversial "Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration" (GCM) adopted by the UN and over 150 of its member states in December of 2018.

Among other goals, the global agreement aims to facilitate the expansion of what the UN describes as "regular migration," providing more legal pathways for would-be immigrants seeking to re-settle in wealthier countries such as the United States.

But this hurts citizens in the receiving countries, as well as in the sending countries.

Take, for instance, El Salvador: That country's President Nayib Bukele explained on *Tucker Carlson Tonight* that the millions who flee Central and South America create and continue problems at home and abroad. Not only do the migrants have to be cared for by the receiving country (because the cost of living is so high in the United States, and the migrants are largely uneducated), but their exodus allows bad governments south of America's border to stay in business. The money the migrants send back to family members in the home countries provides a form of foreign aid, and it lets the governments in the home countries off the hook for making economic and criminal reforms that would benefit the country and those in it. Too, the migrants often represent those who are willing to take risks in starting businesses and those who are willing to work hard, meaning fewer future jobs and opportunities for their countrymen.

The plan to have Western countries take in the world's poor has no chance of alleviating poverty. For instance, here in America, Biden's plan to provide citizenship to illegal immigrants and loosen immigration and asylum restrictions to the point of vanishing would be well beyond the country's financial means, since even before the COVID shutdowns the country was implementing deficit spending to the tune of about a trillion dollars a year, and the deficit spending has been greatly ramped up since then.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

In the United States, a 2017 study from the Federation for Federal Immigration Reform showed that in education expenses, welfare benefits, law-enforcement and medical payments, and miscellaneous costs, illegal immigrants cost state, local, and national governments about \$116 billion per year, yet the illegal immigrants pay only about \$19 billion in taxes — quite literally picking Americans' pockets. This generally aligns with 2017 findings from the Center for Immigration Studies that found that the "total lifetime fiscal drain of [America's present illegal immigrants is approximately] \$746.3 billion. This assumes 11.43 million illegal immigrants are in the country based on the U.S. government's most recent estimate." And with Biden moving to legalize the border jumpers who are already here, the illegal immigrants are on track to become eligible for Social Security benefits and increased welfare, supercharging their expenses. The immigrant population is already beginning to explode, with Biden refusing to allow border protection.

Such influxes of poor, uneducated immigrants would affect the Medicare system and Medicaid, which are both already failing: By the year 2026 (five years away), *Medicare* will *not* have a trust fund, and premiums paid by beneficiaries will only cover about 25 percent of the program's costs, according to that program's trustees.

So mass immigration means less money is available for U.S. retirees and welfare recipients, and signals massive upcoming inflation and taxes — more costs globalists are all too happy to burden us with.

Not only does massive immigration by poor, uneducated individuals hurt welfare recipients and the aged in America, it hurts low-wage workers, especially blacks and other minorities. The 2013 article "Immigration and the American Worker" by immigration economist George Borjas states, "Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated \$99 to \$118 billion a year." And the groups most negatively affected by this immigration are the poor, uneducated, and blacks. Studies show that

immigrants who entered the country from 1990 to 2010 reduced the average annual earnings of American workers by \$1,396 in the short run. Because immigration (legal and illegal) increased the supply of workers unevenly, the impact varies across skill groups, with high school dropouts being the most negatively affected group.

... The wage impact shows that a 10 percent increase in the size of a skill group reduced the fraction of native-born blacks in that group holding a job by 5.1 percentage points.

Ironically, globalists' plans would not even make a dent in the world poverty problem. Central and South America combined are growing by nearly five and half million people per year, and if the United States accepted just that number of people per year, America's infrastructure and government programs would undoubtedly be overwhelmed. Likewise, with Africa growing at more than 34 million people per year, Europe doesn't stand a chance of assimilating the poor from that continent.

Obviously, the globalists know this, which is why they are so very fond of China's population-control experiment, which for decades only allowed one child per family. But unless globalists literally sterilize the poor of the world — which could very likely be one of the globalists' goals since most globalists, such as Bill Gates, are huge proponents of abortion — the poor are still going to have children.

Also, with the same fervor that globalists work to eliminate borders, they are working to eliminate many



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

copyright rules, mandating the dissemination of what were heretofore trade secrets so that poor countries can supposedly compete.

This plan, too, is doomed to fail to spread prosperity: Giving technological secrets to poor countries will fail because most poor countries are strictly socialist/totalitarian, and such countries unerringly fail to use resources wisely or to help the poor. Venezuela, one of the most oil-rich countries in the world, has become increasingly impoverished year after year, and has done so since it went socialist under Hugo Chávez. Likewise Nigeria, another oil-rich country, took in hundreds of billions of dollars in oil revenues between 1970 and 2005, yet no one can tell where the money actually went. Needless to say, access to resources didn't make a dent in poverty.

To dispute the above facts about upcoming suffering that will soon be visited upon the middle and lower classes in the West, globalists would be sure to insist they intend to give every person on Earth a "Basic Economic Income" to survive, so there's no need to worry about poverty. But there's no way government giveaways can be both plentiful and long-lasting.

As an example, though the U.S. government is now providing huge COVID money giveaways that literally pay many Americans more than they would likely earn by working, that situation can't last without hyperinflation occurring, causing the poor and middle class to be worse off than they were previously. A California professor determined that for each trillion the government spends, each person in the country owes approximately \$3,000 to government to pay for the spending (\$12,000 for a family of four), meaning that just the last \$1.9 trillion COVID giveaway, which led to a \$1,400 check to each middle- and low-income American adult, will end up costing a family of four nearly \$24,000. Whether that money is taxed directly or through inflation and other cost increases, it will come out of Americans' pockets. So when the globalists tout a Basic Economic Income for everyone, they *really* mean a "basic" income.

Again, wealth cannot be printed, only manufactured, grown, and earned, so the only way globalists can spread wealth under their plan is to take it from those who already have it and give it away. And they aren't going to take it from *the rich*: If a U.S. federal tax took fully 50 percent of income from those in this country who make over \$200,000 per year, the additional tax money generated would barely be enough to *pay off the country's yearly deficit* prior to COVID spending, taking in only a little over \$900 billion. (And such taxation would devastate state tax receipts.) So America's rich *will not* be providing money to pay for new equity/welfare programs. That leaves the middle class and poor to pay additional taxes. Think about that: Globalists are essentially promising to make the poor and middle class well-off using tax money that the poor and middle class themselves provide — even as globalist elites legislate away jobs and flood the West with poor immigrants. Question: Does that make sense to anyone?

The globalist elitists' litany of professed goals includes ending racism, giving healthcare to all, ensuring inexpensive and efficient trade, providing clean air and water, lowering crime, increasing women's rights, lessening world strife, preventing or quickly ending pandemics, giving more room to wildlife, etc. But an overriding commonality of all the goals is that the means to achieve them always includes hurting the poor and middle class and canceling free speech, freedom of choice, individual power and privacy, etc.

No wonder globalists seldom come right out and tell what their true intentions are. But what they do say, as well as the actions they take, ought to set alarm bells ringing and cause a political uprising to



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

---

stop it.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on July 2, 2021

Published in the July 19, 2021 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 37, No. 14

## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,  
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



**Subscribe**

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.